



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

discussion, which places beside the special pleading of the advocate all the data contained in the document under review.

Pott's particular contention is that the Western text of Acts, preserved in Codex Bezae, is inferior to and of later origin than that prevailing in the original sources to which O bears testimony. He finds O closely related to the emended form of the Philoxenian Syriac, as well as to Minuscule 137 of Milan, and cleverly presses the claims of his group-combination OMP^h as against D and its supporters, where they differ. This favorite group, moreover, is found to reflect, in its purest extant form, Luke's *Acta Pauli* based upon Luke's personal notes (*Wir-Bericht*), and which was afterward worked up, with additional matter, into our Acts of the apostles.

For originality and ingenuity, in his attempted solution of the intricate matters involved, Pott is worthy to be named in the same class with such masters of the craft as Spitta, Jüngst, and Wendt.

CHAS. F. SITTEKLY.

MADISON, N. J.

DIE QUELLE DER KANONISCHEN KINDHEITSGESCHICHTE JESUS'.
Von LUDWIG CONRADY. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &
Ruprecht, 1900. Pp. x + 342. M. 8.

THIS book is not presented in the spirit of controversy nor to overthrow the theory of Resch's *Kindheitsevangeliūm*. While the author deems Resch's theory inadequate, he nevertheless agrees with Resch in postulating a Hebrew original. The material is treated under four main divisions: (1) the tracing of a source in the canonical childhood story; (2) the source in its relation to the canonical story; (3) the justification of the choice of source; and (4) a study of the source by itself.

In the first division the author points out that Matthew merely refers to an already well-known infancy story, and, according to his custom, endeavors to legitimize the same by quoting Old Testament prophecy. Were Matthew the first-hand narrator of such important and startling facts, he would have had to amplify his narrative. That he has a Greek source is indicated by his explanation of such terms as "Jesus" and "Immanuel." His knowledge of the events of the first two years of Jesus' life is very poor, and his references to time and place are studiously vague to hide his ignorance and facilitate the introduction of Old Testament quotations.

Luke, like Matthew, is *tendenziös* in that he attempts to accomplish

the self-same task by "artistic composition" and a free use of the same source and of Matthew. Matthew and Luke are in essential harmony: *e. g.*, the mother's name, her virginity, conception by the Holy Spirit, the relation between Joseph and Mary, Christ's Davidic descent, the birthplace, and the fact of a real birth. The differences can be accounted for by Luke's pushing of Mary into the foreground, his attempt to make a more finished story, and one bearing some relation to his gospel, which last result was accomplished by his weaving in of the story of John the Baptist as a foil for that of Christ. Both accounts aim to discredit in a measure the original. They are anti-docetic, and attempt to convert their docetic source into material for the use and defense of orthodoxy.

In the second division the source is maintained to be the *protevangelium* of James (!); and this source, it is alleged, was used, lost, found, and condemned as apocryphal. The author's attempt to show the dependence of Matthew and Luke upon this source is as unsuccessful as it is painstaking, subjective, and ingenious.

The vindication of the choice of source by an appeal to the patristic and apocryphal literature is very imperfect. For, except in the case of Justin Martyr (and possibly Celsus), the author proves only that various early Christian writers from Ignatius to Epiphanius used the *protevangelium* of James *or* the canonical stories. From an examination of Justin Martyr the author passes over the evidence of two hundred years very lightly, devoting a paragraph to Irenæus, some three lines to Origen, and a little over a page to Clement of Alexandria; while Tertullian, Hippolytus, Novatian, Archelaus, Victorinus, Peter of Alexandria, and Alexander of Alexandria are quite overlooked. But all of these contribute to the study in hand, Irenæus having some thirty-five references to the virgin birth alone, of which eleven at least bear directly upon the problem; Tertullian forty-three, of which eight treat specifically of the topic in hand; Origen twenty-five, of which seven contribute to the source problem; and Hippolytus forty, of which three are relevant to the problem of the source, while each of the others has at least one significant reference. Why pass over these to come to Epiphanius? Conrady thinks that, with the exception of the gospel of Thomas, all other apocryphal New Testament writings are essentially harmonies of the canonical child history and the *protevangelium* of James, which is an original work.

Conrady denies the composite character of the *protevangelium*, and finds one hundred and thirty traces of false translations, and many

other characteristics which necessitate a Hebrew original. The book, written about the year 120 and translated soon after, is an Egyptian (probably Alexandrian) semi-Christian invention made from a certain knowledge of the Old Testament, a poor knowledge of Hebrew law and custom, and a better knowledge of Egyptian mythology. The author writes as a child of his time to the children of his time, and the book is an evidence of the infusion of Egyptian cult into the church.

Looking at Conrady's "scientific investigation" as a whole, one cannot fail to admire his scholarly, thorough, and often ingenious work, while at the same time one feels that the very minuteness and subjectiveness of the investigation nullify for the most part all of his important conclusions.

T. ALLAN HOBEN.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

CHRISTIANITY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE. By GEORGE T. PURVES, D.D., LL.D. With Maps. New York: Scribner, 1900. Pp. xxii + 343. \$1.25.

TEN EPOCHS OF CHURCH HISTORY: *The Apostolic Age, its Life, Doctrine, Worship, and Polity*. By JAMES VERNON BARTLET, M.A. New York: Scribner, 1899. Pp. xlv + 542. \$2 net.

THE series to which the former of these two volumes belongs is said to have for its aim "to present in concise and attractive form the results of investigation and exploration in the broad fields of biblical history, literature, and teaching." In the view of the "critical scholarship" on which the contributions were to be based, the results of this kind attained during the last quarter-century have been unprecedented in amount and value. The literary enterprise itself indicates that editors and publishers to some extent share this belief. One rises, however, from a careful study of this volume with the impression that to the author's mind there are few results of any value, even after research and criticism have been humored in their irrational attempt to improve upon tradition. What the author writes in a brief defense of the authenticity of 2 Peter is characteristic: "We should be slow to believe that the churches, which rejected other works pretending to be his, were imposed on by so daring a forgery." It makes no difference that a large part of the churches at the time in question did *not* reject the forgeries, while all whose opinion was best informed *did* reject, or were at least suspicious of, 2 Peter. The judgment of unknown voters